

Dr Charles Mackays poem
The Souls of the Children
at the end of 4th Report of William
Learner School.

© 2nd Year other pamphlets by L. G. and
Commission Collection under the Ministry

Contents.

- Lectures on popular education.
Criminal Legislation.
Votes on the new Reformation in
Germany.
National Education.
Science & Religion.
Physiology in common Schools.
The currency question.
Reply to pamphlets on the -
currency question.
Our Rule in India.
Answer to attack on the -
Constitution of Man.

all the above by
George Combe.

Williams's Secular School in
Edinburgh. - Six Reports.
What should Secular Education embrace.

WORKS BY GEORGE COMBE.

- I. A SYSTEM OF PHRENOLOGY. 5th edition, revised by JAMES COXE, M.D. With four Plates, and above seventy Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 1037, 15s. cloth. This work has been translated into the French and German languages.
- * * The 52 pages reprinted in this edition may be had separately, price 1s.
- II. ELEMENTS OF PHRENOLOGY. 8th edition, improved, with numerous illustrations. 12mo, pp. 233, price 3s. 6d. boards.
- III. OUTLINES OF PHRENOLOGY. 9th edition, 8vo, pp. 33. Illustrated with Engravings on Wood.
- IV. THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN. 8th edition, enlarged, post 8vo, pp. 567, cloth lettered.—“The People’s Edition,” royal 8vo., price 1s. 6d. sewed.
- This work has been translated into French, German, and Swedish; and 92,000 copies have been printed in the United Kingdom.
- V. MORAL PHILOSOPHY; or, the Duties of Man: Individual, Domestic, and Social. 2nd edition, crown 8vo., pp. 440, 7s. 6d. boards.—“The People’s Edition” (3rd Edition, Second Impression), royal 8vo., pp. 116, price 2s. sewed.
- VI. PHRENOLOGY APPLIED TO PAINTING AND SCULPTURE. 8vo, pp. 178, price 3s. 6d.
- VII. THE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF ANDREW COMBE, M.D. 1 vol. 8vo, price 14s. boards.
- VIII. NOTES (Moral, Religious, Political, Economical, Educational, and Phrenological) on the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. 3 vols. post 8vo., price £1 11s. 6d. boards.
- IX. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE CEREBELLUM. By Drs. GALL, VIMONT, and BROUSSAIS. Translated from the French. In 1 vol. 8vo, pp. 390, price 5s.
- X. THE PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINAL LEGISLATION AND PRISON DISCIPLINE INVESTIGATED. 8vo, pp. 105, price 2s.
- XI. LECTURES ON POPULAR EDUCATION. 3rd edition, enlarged, 8vo, pp. 82, price 1s. 8d. sewed.
- XII. WHAT SHOULD SECULAR EDUCATION EMBRACE? 8vo, pp. 34, price 6d.
- XIII. REMARKS ON NATIONAL EDUCATION. 5th edition, 8vo. pp. 38, price 4d.
- XIV. ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT. 8vo, pp. 16, price 3d.
- XV. ANSWER TO THE ATTACK ON THE “CONSTITUTION OF MAN,” by the Rev. C. J. KENNEDY, sanctioned by the “ASSOCIATION FOR OPPOSING PREVALENT ERRORS.” Price 3d.

OUR RULE IN INDIA.

BY GEORGE COMBE.

NOTE.

IN "The Constitution of Man," and "The Relation between Science and Religion," the doctrine is propounded, that there is a real practical Divine government of the world; that it is not miraculous or supernatural, but is conducted through the qualities, modes of action, and relations bestowed upon things and beings by Divine power and wisdom; that it is scrutable, intelligible, and moral; and that it determines the conditions on which persons, communities, and nations may either attain to, and preserve physical and mental well-being, or plunge themselves into suffering, and that in each case the intensity and duration of the good or evil evolved will correspond to the extent of obedience to, or departure from, the requirements of the Divine laws.

In 1847 these principles were applied to the case of India, in the 8th edition (post 8vo) of "The Constitution of Man," then published in the following words:—"History has not yielded half her fruits, and cannot yield them until mankind shall possess a true theory of their own nature, and a religion in harmony with the order of Providence. England has still much to learn in this respect. Her conquest and dominion of India is immoral; and as God's laws can neither be abrogated nor evaded, serious social evils must, at this moment, be flowing to herself from the immoral action, in her own social circles, of the selfish and domineering propensities which have prompted her to make and to retain that violent acquisition. At the same time, these conquests could not occur without weakness and immorality predominating in the subjected nation. Their fate is the consequence of their own low moral, intellectual, and physical condition; and apparently the scourge, even of foreign oppression, is intended to stimulate its victims to greater energy of action, or to sweep them away as encumberers of the soil. The first aim of Nature seems to be to develop strength, and to give the world to the energetic. Among moral beings, however, that strength must be regulated by morality, or they must suffer. The immoral may *possess*, but the natural law declares they shall not *enjoy*, the earth.

"If I might hazard a conjecture in regard to India, I should hope, that before the close of another century, the public mind of Great Britain will have made so great a progress in the knowledge of, and belief in, the moral order of God's providence, that it will compel her rulers, either to relinquish that conquest as prejudicial equally to England and India, or to administer it on the principles of morality for the benefit of the Indian people themselves. It may be affirmed that this is already done, and that under British sway India is now more prosperous and happy than she ever was under her native princes. English testimony, however, is not competent to establish this proposition; and we have never heard it confirmed by the general voice of the conquered people. Besides, it is notorious that we rule India as a conquered nation, and deprive her people of all high places of honour and authority in the administration of their own affairs. A moral government of India would imply a thorough education of her people in the natural laws, and training them to reverence and obey them; the employment of them in the administration of their own government; placing them on a footing of equality, in rights and rank, with the British; and preparing them to become a free, moral, and intellectual people. If we should ever bring them into this condition, and be contented to act towards them on the principles of beneficence and justice, we might withdraw our armies, and enjoy all the profits of their commerce from the bonds of interest, respect, and affection, which such conduct would evoke.

"These ideas will probably appear chimerical and utopian to most readers, but the other alternative is not fanciful. While the British public mind continues to disbelieve in God's moral government of the world, and to sanction the present system of domination in India, British institutions will never become thoroughly moral at home; and so long as they continue immoral, her religion will prove a rope of sand to bind her people to virtue; her wealth will be a snare, and her power will have a canker at its core that will eat out its strength, and add her empire to the list of those that have fallen by their defiance of God's moral providence, and their reliance on their own animal and intellectual superiority."

These observations were presented, not as random prophecies, or as the results of superior discernment, but as inductions from the principles of the work when applied to history; and it is only as such that they possess any value. They are here cited, to show that the views expressed in the following Letters were not *stated à posteriori*, by the late events in India, but that they flow from the principles *stated à priori*, in 1847. The only difference between the conclusions then drawn, and those contained in the Letters, consists in the prospect of our being able to govern India with advantage to the natives and honour and profit to ourselves, being rendered darker by the late disclosures, than it was when the inferences rested only on the basis of general principles.

The Letters appeared in the *Daily Scotsman* of the 19th of February 1858; and as requests for copies continue to reach me, they are reprinted for circulation.*

* Sold by Simpkin, Marshall, & Co., London; and by MacLachlan & Stewart. Edinburgh. Price 2d.

To the Editor of the Scotsman.

EDINBURGH, 10th February 1858.

SIR,—In thanking my friend, Mr William Richard Young of Oldfield Lodge, Maidenhead, for a copy of his pamphlet—“A Few Words on the Indian Question”—I took occasion to express certain views of our Indian conquest not generally entertained, with the object of eliciting his remarks upon them. For several years he had administered a district in India, and was therefore well qualified to judge of our position. With his permission, I now place the correspondence at your disposal, if you should consider it likely to interest your readers, and to promote the cause of truth.—I am, &c. GEO. COMBE.

I. LETTER—GEORGE COMBE to W. R. YOUNG, Esq.

I am a great heretic in regard to India, for I regard our conquest of it as a blunder as well as a crime. My reasons are these:—

Love of independence is an elementary feeling in human nature which cannot be extinguished. Hence the slave has an indestructible longing and right to be free; and no oaths, vows, or even benefits conferred, can deprive him of the right to assert his personal freedom if he can.

In our social capacity as a nation or tribe, the same feeling assumes the form of love of national independence, or patriotism. It is distinct from the love of political liberty. The French would die to a man to prevent England or Russia from conquering France, and ruling it as a conquest; but they permit tyrants of their own creation to rule over them without a murmur. In 1812, the Russians made gigantic sacrifices to preserve their national independence against French dominion; but, having achieved this, they quietly submitted to the iron despotism of their own Emperor.

In India we are conquerors. Our superior prowess has extinguished all national independence there. The people are ruled by men aliens in race, in religion, and in language. No arguments will persuade me that this can be *acceptable* to the natives of India; for the feeling of patriotism or love of national independence is indestructible. Very feeble, and very ignorant, and very timid *individuals* may lack the feeling; but it blazes forth as manhood, intelligence, and civilisation increase.

By conquest, *might* takes the place of *right*. It is *immoral* to dominate over an inferior race, and to deprive them of national existence; and good fruits never grow on an evil soil.

While the natives remain ignorant and divided, we *may* rule them by the sword ; but at what cost ? We cannot take root there, and increase, and multiply ; and we cannot even amalgamate with the natives. Climate and difference of physiological constitution preclude both. We must, therefore, continually transport 20,000 Europeans annually across half the globe, to supply the loss of the dominant power by deaths, sickness, and age ;* and what is our reward ? We pay our countrymen for the duty of governing, out of the revenues of India. Would not equal exertions be accompanied by an equal reward in Australia, Canada, or the United States ? If not, then, the surplus pay is extortion. We have a profit on our trade with India. It is a bagatelle in the profits of England's trade, and might be had although we were not conquerors there. But even although it were lost, the *gain* on the traffic, even at fifteen or twenty per cent. on the value of the commodities, would not exceed three or four millions per annum ; and while we rule by the sword, we shall expend all the Indian revenues, and as much of our own money as this profit will cover, in maintaining our dominion. Moreover, no prospect of gaining profit by trade can justify conquest. To *force* a people to buy and sell with us is to oppress them, and, as they will think, to *cheat* them. If they consider our trade beneficial to them, they will seek it voluntarily.

It is said that we have never injured, but caressed, pampered, and spoiled the Sepoys, who took our pay and swore fidelity to our standards *voluntarily*. This may be true ; but their revolt shows that when we have, by our discipline and instruction, brought out their manhood, they have felt the degradation of their position, and their instinctive emotions have revolted from the service we have assigned to them—viz., that of watch-dogs over their conquered countrymen. We must reverse all the lessons of history, and call Tell and the Swiss of his day, rebels ; the Spanish patriots of 1809, traitors to Joseph Bonaparte ; the Saxon regiments which in 1813 went over from the French camp into that of Prussia, foresworn scoundrels, &c. ; otherwise, we must recognise in these Sepoys patriots like the followers of Bruce and Wallace. They are cruel barbarians, and I abhor them for their massacres ; but *we* are *conquerors*, and the right to assert their independence is indestructible. When slaves rise, they murder their masters. This is very horrid ; but the

* Since the text was published, the following observations appeared in "*The Globe*." The Paris correspondent of that paper, writing in March 1858, says—"The mortality of Indian civilians, which, had they remained in England, would have been 10 in 1000 (per annum), " becomes 20 " (per annum) " in the first five years of their arrival ; and 35 " (per annum) " for the next fifteen years of their sojourn, notwithstanding furloughs. This fact is based on accurate data from 1790 to 1835."

man who holds another in slavery should know that he is outraging one of the indestructible feelings of humanity, and never can be safe while he continues to do so. And it is the same in national conquests.

All conquests that have ended in good have been those in which the dominant power laid aside its exclusive pretensions, and amalgamated with the vanquished, and raised all to equal rights. This was England's case after the Norman conquest; and Ireland, while ruled as a conquest, was a curse to England. India cannot be held by amalgamation; and in proportion as we enlighten and civilise the natives, we shall awaken their feelings of patriotism, deepen their sense of degradation, and prepare them for rebellion.

Our rule, therefore, is an enterprise against nature, and no human power will suffice to bring fruits of peace, profit, and well-being, either to ourselves or to our conquered subjects, out of it.

This is a terrible heresy; but I cannot help embracing it. Nevertheless, I do not insist on any one's becoming my disciple, and accord to all the full freedom of opinion which I here claim for myself.

Of course, I desire the present rebellion and anarchy to be brought to a close, and do not see how we could abandon India with advantage to the natives in the present state of things. All I contend for is, that our conquest was a blunder, and that it will prove not a pearl of great price in our Queen's crown, but a thorn in our sides, until we escape from it in one way or other.—I am, &c.

GEO. COMBE.

II. LETTER—W. R. YOUNG, Esq. to GEORGE COMBE.

OLDFIELD LODGE, MAIDENHEAD,
February 4, 1858.

MY DEAR SIR,—There is little or no difference of opinion between us as to the immorality of all interferences, by violence or fraud, with the natural rights and liberties of our weaker fellow-creatures. The conqueror and the kidnapper stand pretty nearly in the same position in the eye of justice and reason, although a widely different judgment is passed by the world on the acts of the two—our strict notions of right and wrong being sadly twisted by the influence of “glory.” I also think with you that the natural right of men to assert their independence whenever an opportunity for so doing pre-

sents itself, is not qualified nor diminished by a lengthened submission to, or acquiescence in, the act of subjugation, nor even by the mildness of the restraint imposed upon the subjected. But although the right to resist may, according to the canons of morality, be recognised equally in all cases, the sympathies of mankind—even the wisest and best portion—will be excited in very different degrees, according to the circumstances of the cases.

India at this moment offers two examples, which, in my judgment, afford a good illustration of the extent to which sympathy may be modified by the circumstances under which resistance may be made to a dominant power. There is the revolt of our Sepoys, who for a period of 100 years (they and their forefathers) have not only submitted to our rule, but have assisted us in the subjugation of the numerous provinces which have been added to our Indian empire since the time of the battle of Plassey. They have always been well treated, and their complaints have at all times been readily—some say *too* readily—attended to; yet in a moment, without warning, and apparently without any definite object, they rise on us, and for a time put our empire in jeopardy. It is pressing the principle of the righteousness of resistance to subjection to its extremest limits to suppose that these men were actuated by the feelings of patriotism and the passion for liberty which attract our sympathy.

Look, on the other hand, to the kingdom of Oude. Here we see not only a soldiery, but a whole people in revolt. They look upon us as robbers and oppressors, who have dethroned their King, and taken forcible possession of their country without a shadow of right or justice; they have never in the slightest degree acquiesced in our invasion nor submitted to our rule. On the contrary, they have from the first offered all the opposition which men overawed by the force of arms could offer to our dominion; and they have seized the very first opportunity, when our attention was distracted by the events at Meerut and Delhi, and the force which held Oude was weakened, to rise as one man and expel us from the country. There is the principle of resistance in a form which commends itself in the strongest manner to the approval of those who wish well to the cause of liberty. If it were not for the cruelties and barbarities of the Oude men at the commencement of the struggle, when they were dealing with a few unresisting white men, I should view their efforts with entire approbation and with the warmest sympathy; for their cause is, beyond all doubt, righteous.

With regard to the cruelties practised by the revoltors, it would appear, since there has been time to get at the real

facts, and opportunity to test the accuracy of the harrowing narratives which at first came from the scene of the disturbances, that there has been very great exaggeration, if not absolute falsification, on the part of the narrators. There is no doubt but that a great many of our people were murdered under circumstances of great atrocity; but the stories of tortures, mutilations, and violations are not only unconfirmed, but are denied on apparently very competent authority, as you have no doubt observed, in the *Times*. Mr J. P. Grant was calumniated in the most disgraceful manner; and you have no doubt observed that some men who are generally spoken of as models of piety, charity, and truth do not scruple, when it will serve their turn, to attribute to their Indian fellow-subjects every description of fiendish atrocity, upon evidence of the weakest and most unsubstantial character, and that in their zeal they will even quote as their authority persons who have never said what is attributed to them. They are now aware that they have been deceived, and I do not press the charge farther against them, but only remark, that the time has not yet come when people will bear to hear reason in reference to the late events in India. When that time *does* come, the history of the matter will be very different from that which would be compiled from the columns of the newspapers, and from the speeches uttered at Exeter Hall.

None of the causes to which the outbreak has been attributed will, in my judgment, account for it. Our self-love will not allow us to ascribe it to a general hatred of our dominion, and a desire to get rid of it, which *would* account for it, and which will probably be the interpretation placed by history on the events which have occurred. Yet it is undeniable that, on the whole, the people of India are under our government much better off than they were under the Mahomedan rule.

With respect to the possibility of any united popular movement in India with a view to shake off a foreign yoke, such a contingency cannot, I think, be contemplated, considering the elements to be combined. The population of India is divided into two great sections—Hindoo and Mahomedan—between which an irreconcilable difference subsists. Neither in religion, habits, nor social conditions could they by any possibility be made to amalgamate. It is conceivable that some great oppression might urge them to take up arms, and fight in the same ranks against their common oppressor. But, even if success attended their movement, they must inevitably, as soon as the danger passed away, come to blows amongst themselves; and the Mussulmans, though numerically the weaker section, being in courage, physical strength, energy, and determination superior to the other, would assuredly get the

upper hand. Would anything be gained to the cause of liberty or humanity by such a series of occurrences? I think not; and therefore I desire that our position in India, however questionable may be the means by which we obtained it, should be maintained.

No doubt, we must pay the penalty exacted from all conquerors—the hatred of the subjugated. Although I really believe that our Government is, on the whole, the justest and most honest which has ever existed in India, I am quite certain that we are not loved, and I believe that our expulsion from the country would cause little regret, if it did not occasion joy. But this is not because we are tyrannical and unjust, but because we are foreigners.—I am, &c. W. R. YOUNG.

III. LETTER—GEORGE COMBE to W. R. YOUNG, Esq.

EDINBURGH, 6th February 1858.

MY DEAR SIR,—I am much interested by your letter of the 4th February. There are very trivial differences between your views and mine, and perhaps a few observations may tend to diminish even them.

Our friend Professor Horace H. Wilson, having been educated for the medical profession, and having acquired the languages of India, and lived long in it, and come into close communication with the natives, is a high authority concerning the physiological and mental qualities of the different races who inhabit the Peninsula. I applied to him, therefore, for information concerning the numerical and physiological differences between the Mahomedans and Hindoos. He informs me that the proportion of these races differs considerably in different parts of the country, but that, in an estimate of the whole, one Mahomedan to seven, or even to ten, Hindoos, is reckoned an approximation to the truth.

The Mahomedans are of various races—Affghans, Arabs, Persians, and even Abyssinians and Turks. These rarely brought their women with them, but intermarried with the native Indians; and the present Mahomedans are chiefly their descendants. Others are the children of Hindoo proselytes to Islam.

Climate and intermarriage have made the Mahomedans very much the same as the Hindoos, both physically and morally. In the upper provinces, and among the higher orders, they are generally fairer and stouter men; but the lower classes are as black and slightly made as the lower class Hindoos, especially in Bengal and the south.

Here, then, we see the Mahomedan conquerors fused into similarity to their subjects in their physiological qualities—the chief distinction remaining between them being in their religions. This presents the greatest obstacle to their being combined and acting as one people.

One consequence of this amalgamation of blood has been that the Mahomedans have lost much of the natural superiority of race which they possessed when they conquered the country ; and this corresponds with history, for I read that their empire was falling to pieces when the British conquests began, and that our rule became possible by the natural dissolution of theirs.

If I am right in these facts, the only question that remains is—Whether it is either the duty or the interest of Great Britain to take upon herself the conquest and government of such a country ? The Mahomedans lost their strength and their empire by amalgamation. What, then, are our prospects of maintaining a permanent dominion in India ? We cannot live and multiply there ; and we recoil from amalgamation by intermarriage. We must, therefore, rule by the sword, and keep up our numbers by constant immigrations of Britain's best sons and daughters. If we abjure plunder and extortion, I do not see how we can enrich ourselves by our conquest.

Granting that our government will be more beneficent and just than any of the natives could establish, is it *our duty* to act as their guardians and governors ? Look at the pages of history. England had a heptarchy, and perpetual wars raged between her petty kings : Germany had eighteen Sovereign Princes who fought furiously for centuries with each other. Did the people of those days sigh for foreign conquerors to extinguish those contests ? Europe has now many Kings and Emperors who, to this day, lead hostile armies into each other's territories, and try to conquer. Do we now pray for a more powerful and more highly gifted race to come and conquer us all, and rule us in peace and justice ? Our civilised nature revolts at the proposition ; and how much more must the nature of a semi-barbarous race—who feel the pride of independence more strongly than the emotions of beneficence and justice—be affronted by it ? We are agreed that the natives of India never can love us or our yoke, because we are conquerors and foreigners. Let us not, therefore, force unacceptable peace and justice on them, which they do not prize at our hands. What we call peace and justice must appear to them oppression, because conquest poisons its source. Let us, then, restore order, and devise means to slip out of our conquered territories as soon as this can be advantageously accomplished,—I am, &c.

GEO. COMBE.

ANSWER BY GEORGE COMBE

TO THE

ATTACK ON "THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN,"

CONTAINED IN

NATURE AND REVELATION HARMONIOUS: A DEFENCE OF SCRIPTURE TRUTHS ASSAILED IN MR GEORGE COMBE'S WORK ON THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN, &c., BY THE REV. C. J. KENNEDY, PAISLEY; PUBLISHED UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE SCOTTISH ASSOCIATION FOR OPPOSING PREVALENT ERRORS."

"Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"—MATTHEW viii. 3.

EDINBURGH:

MACLACHLAN, STEWART, & CO.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.

DUBLIN: JAMES M'GLASHAN.

MDCCCXLVIII.

Price Threepence.



